

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this Application. Reconsideration and further examination of the subject patent application in light of the present Amendment and Remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Pat. Publ. No. US 2005/0154598 to Kanayama et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,012,523 to Stuart. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

In response, independent claim 1 has been further amended to the context “wherein an alarm event detected by a security sensor of the security system causes the security sensor to transmit an RF security/alarm event message to the security system cameras which causes the security system video cameras to awaken from the standby inactive video mode into the active video recording mode.” Independent claim 11 has been similarly amended. The awakening of the security system video cameras in response to an alarm event detected by a security sensor is discussed in paragraph [0014] of the specification.

Claims 1-20 are now clearly differentiated over Kanayama et al. and Stuart. For example, Kanayama et al. is merely directed to a low cost security system where charges for use are based upon the number of sensors 12 and the time activated. Moreover, “The trespasser sensor 12b is activated around the clock; upon detection of an abnormality, it sends a detection signal to the

sensor control section to request that the security camera 12a start operation” (Kanayama et al., par. [0104]).

Similarly Stuart is merely directed to camera on a peephole of an entrance door. The Stuart camera may be activated by a doorbell signal to, in turn, place a call to a homeowner.

As such, neither Kanayama et al. or Stuart or the combination of Kanayama et al. and Stuart provide any teaching or suggestion of the context “wherein an alarm event detected by a security sensor of the security system causes the security sensor to transmit an RF security/alarm event message to the security system cameras which causes the security system video cameras to awaken from the standby inactive video mode into the active video recording mode.” Moreover, this difference is functional because it allows the recording of an intruder even where a central control panel has been compromised by the intruder or by a power failure.

Since the combination fails to teach or suggest this feature, the combination fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Since the combination fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation, the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

Closing Remarks

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicits an early Notice of Allowance. Should the Primary Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Primary Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below-

Appl. No. 10/733,727
Amendment under Rule 37 CFR § 1.112

listed number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee which may be required for this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.18, including but not limited to the issue fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. Should no proper amount be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. *(If filed by paper, a duplicate copy of this sheet(s) is enclosed).*

Respectfully submitted,

HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS
WELSH & KATZ

By: 

Jon P. Christensen
Registration No. 34,137

Paul M. Vargo
Registration No. 29,116

Dated: December 15, 2009

HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS
WELSH & KATZ
120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 2200
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500